

1 DANIEL J. BERGESON, Bar No. 105439
 2 dbergeson@be-law.com
 3 JOHN W. FOWLER, Bar No. 037463
jfowler@be-law.com
 4 MELINDA M. MORTON, Bar No. 209373
mmorton@be-law.com
 5 BERGESON, LLP
 6 303 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 500
 7 San Jose, CA 95110-2712
 Telephone: (408) 291-6200
 Facsimile: (408) 297-6000

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 8 VERIGY US, INC.

9
 10
 11
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 VERIGY US, INC, a Delaware Corporation

Case No. C07 04330 RMW (HRL)

13 Plaintiff,

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL W.
 STEBBINS IN SUPPORT OF VERIGY'S
 OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO COMPEL
 AMENDED RESPONSES AND
 PRODUCTION OF RESPONSIVE
 DOCUMENTS TO DISCOVERY**

14 vs.

15 ROMI OMAR MAYDER, an individual;
 16 WESLEY MAYDER, an individual; SILICON
 TEST SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation;
 and SILICON TEST SOLUTIONS, LLC, a
 17 California Limited Liability Corporation,
 inclusive,

Date: June 10, 2008
 Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Judge: Honorable Howard R. Lloyd
 Ctrm.: 2

18 Defendants.

20 Complaint Filed: August 22, 2007
 Trial Date: None Set

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 I, Michael W. Stebbins, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law before all of the courts of the State of
 3 California. I am a Partner with the law firm of Bergeson, LLP, counsel of record for Plaintiff,
 4 Verigy US, Inc. ("Verigy") in the above-captioned action. I have personal knowledge of the facts
 5 set forth in this declaration, and, if called to do so, I could and would competently testify thereto.

6 2. I submit this declaration in support of Verigy's opposition to Defendants' motion to
 7 compel the second set of requests for production (the "motion to compel").

8 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of email correspondence
 9 between counsel for Verigy and counsel for Defendants discussing the issues relating to this
 10 motion to compel.

11 4. Verigy construed the second set of requests for production (the "Requests") to call
 12 for documents relating to Verigy's reasonable efforts to maintain the secrecy of the enumerated
 13 trade secrets because of Defendants' pleadings, briefing on the Preliminary Injunction Motion, the
 14 plain meaning of the requests and the language in the relevant UTSA section discussing trade
 15 secrets. Verigy understood the Requests to pertain to whether the trade secrets met the standard of
 16 trade secrets at the time the objections were made, and still, in good faith, believes that this is the
 17 plain meaning of the Requests.

18 5. At the time the Requests were served, Verigy had already produced over 4500
 19 pages of documents in response to Defendants' First Set of Requests, and many of these
 20 documents were responsive to the Requests as well. Verigy produced electronic documents in
 21 response to Requests Nos. 88-89 on February 1, 2008. Verigy produced approximately 210 pages
 22 of additional documents demonstrating that Verigy maintained trade secrets in the trade secrets
 23 listed in its Initial Trade Secret Disclosure on February 8, 2008 and March 21, 2008. The
 24 documents produced show that Verigy employed confidentiality measures at its corporate
 25 headquarters, had confidentiality agreements covering communications with its customers and
 26 potential customers, and had policies regarding computer security and information security.

27 6. The parties finally met and conferred by telephone on April 8, 2008. During this
 28 telephone call, Defendants' counsel, Kevin Pasquinelli, all but admitted that it made no sense to

1 maintain a motion to compel on document requests directed toward Verigy's Initial Trade Secret
2 Disclosure once the amended disclosure was served, but he refused to delay filing the motion
3 because he was not authorized to do so by his client. He indicated only that after the Amended
4 Trade Secret Disclosure was served he would try and convince his client to authorize withdrawing
5 the motion.

6 7. The Requests as rewritten by Defendants would be unduly burdensome because a
7 search for documents responsive to the rewritten requests would involve hundreds, if not
8 thousands, of hours of review and collection for production. Each of the Requests would require
9 an extensive search of documents and email. This exercise would be costly and burdensome,
10 given Verigy's size and number of engineering employees who were involved in the projects listed
11 on the initial trade secret disclosure.

12 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
13 foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed this 20th day of May, 2008 at
14 San Jose, California.

/s/
Michael W. Stebbins